

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/056,117	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WILEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christopher A. Revak	<b>Art Unit</b> 2131	

**All Participants:**

(1) Christopher A. Revak.

(2) David Thompson.

**Status of Application:** response to non-final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 15 February 2007

**Time:** afternoon

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 103

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

Stefik


**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner noted that the applicant argued the teachings of Berg which were no longer applied and did not address the teachings of Stefik. Upon review of the applicant's amendment and arguments pertaining to the limitation of a "controller generating a confirmation message confirming the receipt of the document file", it was determined that Stefik failed to disclose of these limitations..